arXiv:quant-ph/9912030v3 8 Nov 2000

Comment on the Adiabatic Condition

A.C. Aguiar Pinto[(1)], M.C. Nemes[(2)],
J.G. Peixoto de Faria [(2)] and M.T. Thomaz[(1)] *

[(1)] *Instituto de Física - Univ. Federal Fluminense*
Av. Gal. Milton Tavares de Souza s/nº.,
CEP: 24210-340, Niterói, R.J., Brazil

[(2)] *Departamento de Física, ICEX,*
Univ. Federal de Minas Gerais, C.P. 702,
CEP: 30161-970, Belo Horizonte, M.G., Brazil

Abstract

The experimental observation of effects due to Berry's phase in quantum systems is certainly one of the most impressive demonstrations of the correctness of the superposition principle in quantum mechanics. Since Berry's original paper in 1984, the spin 1/2 coupled with rotating external magnetic field has been one of the most studied models where those phases appear. We also consider a special case of this soluble model. A detailed analysis of the coupled differential equations and comparison with exact results teach us why the usual procedure (of neglecting nondiagonal terms) is mathematically sound.

*Corresponding author: Dr. Maria Teresa Thomaz; R. Domingos Sávio Nogueira Saad nº. 120 apto 404, Niterói, R.J., 24210-310, BRAZIL Phone: (21) 620-6735, Fax: (21)620-3881; *E-mail*: mtt@if.uff.br.

The study of quantum systems in the adiabatic regime appeared for the first time in the paper by Born and Fock in 1928[1]. Since their original paper it is known that the time evolution of an instantaneous eigenstate of the time-dependent Hamiltonian acquires a phase besides the dynamical phase. But it was only after Berry's seminal paper in 1984 [2] that this extra phase was raised to the condition of a geometric phase. Different quantum systems in this regime have attracted a lot of attention due to the fact that the existence of those geometric phases introduces a shift in the frequency initially predicted and afterwards experimentally measured. There is a list of experimental articles on observation of Berry's phase in Ref.[3]. More recently, geometric phases were observed in neutrons[4] and in an atomic state interacting with a laser field[5].

Even though the research on quantum systems in the adiabatic regime is still a very active area in physics nowadays, these geometric phases have become an issue included in undergraduate textbooks in quantum mechanics[6]. Certainly this comes from the fact that the measured frequency shift due to the presence of geometric phases is one of the proofs of the linearity of the quantum phenomena.

The traditional characterization of a quantum system in the adiabatic regime is that its interaction with the environment is described through a set of classical time-dependent parameters $\mathbf{R}(t) = (R_1(t), \cdots, R_n(t))$ periodic in time but whose period is much larger than the characteristic time scale involved in the quantum phenomena. The Hamiltonian that drives the quantum system depends on the set $\mathbf{R}(t)$, that is $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(t)]$. Let ω_0 be the angular frequency of $\mathbf{R}(t)$ and ω_i the angular frequencies equal to the difference between two distinct quantum eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(t)]$ divided by $\hbar$. The adiabatic regime is attained when $\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_i} \to 0$, for all ω_i[2, 6, 7]. Under these conditions, we have the so-called the *Adiabatic Theorem*[7]:

For a slowly varing Hamiltonian, the instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian evolve continously into the corresponding eigenstate at a later time.

Let us consider a periodic Hamiltonian that returns to its original operator, that is, $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(T)] = \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(0)]$ when the external classical set $\mathbf{R}(t)$ completes a period. If the initial quantum state is an eigenstate of $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(0)]$, the adiabatic theorem affirms that the evolved state is an eigenstate of the instantaneous Hamiltonian with the same initial quantum number but it is does not forbid it to acquire a phase. This phase can be decomposed into a dynamical phase plus another one that M.V. Berry proved to be geometric[2]. This geometrical phase acquired by instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian chosen as initial state of the quantum system is more easily recognized if the time evolution of the

initial state is described in the basis of the instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(t)]$. To make our notation simpler, we denote: $\mathbf{H}[\mathbf{R}(t)] \equiv \mathbf{H}(t)$. Let $|\psi(0)\rangle$ be the initial state of the quantum system; its time evolution is given by $|\psi(t)\rangle$. We decompose $|\psi(t)\rangle$ on the basis of the instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian:

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n(t) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t E_n(t')dt'} \; |\phi_n; t\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where $|\phi_n; t\rangle$ are the instantaneous eigenstates of $\mathbf{H}(t)$ with eigenvalue $E_n(t)$,

$$\mathbf{H}(t)|\phi_n; t\rangle = E_n(t)|\phi_n; t\rangle. \tag{2}$$

The index n represents a set of quantum numbers that uniquely determine this quantum state. We are assuming that the time-dependent Hamiltonian has N nondegenerate instantaneous eigenstates. The phase $\frac{-i}{\hbar}\int_o^t E_n(t')dt'$ is called the dynamical phase and reduces to $\frac{-iE_nt}{\hbar}$ when the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian are time independent. Requiring expansion (1) to be a solution to the Schrödinger equation

$$\mathbf{H}(t)|\psi(t)\rangle = i\hbar\frac{\partial|\psi(t)\rangle}{\partial t}, \tag{3}$$

we get a set of coupled differential equations for the coefficients $c_n(t)$[2, 6, 7]:

$$\frac{dc_n(t)}{dt} = -\langle\phi_n; t|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\phi_n; t\rangle c_n(t) + \sum_{\substack{m \\ m\neq n}} \frac{\langle\phi_n; t|\frac{\partial\mathbf{H}(t)}{\partial t}|\phi_m; t\rangle}{E_n - E_m} \; e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t (E_n(t')-E_m(t'))dt'} \; c_m(t). \tag{4}$$

From Eq.(1) up to Eq.(4) the expressions are exact. In Refs. [6, 7], the adiabatic approximation is implemented by recognizing that

$$\langle\phi_n; t|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\phi_m; t\rangle = -\frac{\langle\phi_n; t|\frac{\partial\mathbf{H}(t)}{\partial t}|\phi_m; t\rangle}{E_n - E_m}, \qquad \text{for} \quad n \neq m. \tag{5}$$

In this approximation those terms are neglected compared to the elements $\langle\phi_n; t|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\phi_n; t\rangle$ in Eq.(4). After neglecting those terms, the differential equations (4) decouple and each one is easily solved[6, 7].

However, since the non-neglected terms in Eq.(4) are also a measure of how much the instantaneous eigenstates of the Hamiltonian vary with time, they must also be small once this variation in time is due to the interaction with the environment and by hypothesis it is very slow. At first sight this assertion would seem to contradict the traditional derivation of the results in the adiabatic limit[2, 6, 7]. The aim of this note is to show

that this does not happen. We explicitly show this in the context of a soluble model. In the differential equations for the coefficients of the expansion of the vector state [see Eq.(1)] for this model we introduce tracers to follow the contribution of crossed terms to the exact solutions and finally we explicitly show why the adiabatic approximation is correctly obtained by only neglecting the terms (5).

We consider a particular case of the model presented by M.V. Berry in Ref. [2], that is, a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ coupled to an external magnetic field $\vec{B}(t)$ with constant norm B ($B \equiv |\vec{B}(t)|$) that precesses with constant angular frequency ω_0 around the z-axis:

$$\vec{B}(t) = (Bsin(\theta)cos(\omega_0 t), Bsin(\theta)sin(\omega_0 t), Bcos(\theta))\,. \tag{6}$$

All directions in space are equivalent, and we assume that $0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$.

The Hamiltonian of the model is

$$H(t) = \mu \vec{B}(t) \cdot \vec{\mathbf{s}}. \tag{7}$$

The constant μ is written in terms of Landé factor g and Bohr magneton μ_B[8], that is, $\mu = g\mu_B$ and $\vec{\mathbf{s}}$ is the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ operator. Hamiltonian (7) is the interaction energy between the intrinsic magnetic moment of the electron and the external magnetic field[9]. Its instantaneous eigenstates are:

$$|\phi_1; t\rangle = -A|\uparrow\rangle + De^{i\omega_0 t}|\downarrow\rangle \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad E_1 = -\frac{\mu B\hbar}{2} \tag{8}$$

$$|\phi_2; t\rangle = D|\uparrow\rangle + Ae^{i\omega_0 t}|\downarrow\rangle \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad E_2 = \frac{\mu B\hbar}{2}, \tag{9}$$

where $|\uparrow\rangle$ ($|\downarrow\rangle$) is the eigenstate of the component $\mathbf{s}_z$ of the spin operator with eigenvalue $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ ($-\frac{\hbar}{2}$). The state $|\phi_1; t\rangle$ ($|\phi_2; t\rangle$) is the eigenvector of spin down (up) along the direction $\hat{n} = \frac{\vec{B}(t)}{B}$. We defined

$$A \equiv sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad D \equiv cos(\frac{\theta}{2}). \tag{10}$$

The eigenvalues E_1 and E_2 are time independent. For this model, Eq.(1) becomes

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{2} c_n(t) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t E_n(t')dt'}\,|\phi_n; t\rangle. \tag{11}$$

The coefficients $c_1(t)$ and $c_2(t)$ satisfy the differential equations

$$\frac{dc_1(t)}{dt} = -i\omega_0 D^2 c_1(t) - i\omega_0 AD e^{-2i\omega_1 t} c_2(t) \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{dc_2(t)}{dt} = -i\omega_0 AD e^{2i\omega_1 t} c_1(t) - i\omega_0 A^2 c_2(t). \tag{13}$$

In this model we have only one characteristic frequency of the quantum phenomena. It is proportional to the difference of the eigenvalues of Hamiltonian (7),

$$2\omega_1 \equiv \frac{E_2 - E_1}{\hbar} = \mu B. \tag{14}$$

The factor 2 in definition (14) is introduced for convenience. In Eq.(12) the adiabatic approximation ($\omega_0 \to 0$) implies that the $c_2(t)$ on its rhs has to be neglected. However, the coefficient that multiplies $c_1(t)$ on the rhs of the same equation is also proportional to ω_0 although it is not neglected. A similar discussion is valid for Eq.(13) by interchanging $c_1(t)$ and $c_2(t)$. We should remember that in the adiabatic approximation we have no restriction on the θ-angle, except that it has to be different from $\theta = 0^0$ and $\theta = \pi$. At first glance it seems that we are not consistenly keeping the terms in our coupled differential equations (12) and (13). We will see that is not the case and the difference relies on the exponential that multiplies $c_2(t)$ [$c_1(t)$] on the rhs of Eq.(12) [Eq.(13)].

To follow the contribution due to each term on the rhs of Eqs. (12) and (13), we introduce tracers for each term on the rhs in the equations, that is,

$$\frac{dc_1(t)}{dt} = -ia_{11}\omega_0 D^2 c_1(t) - ia\omega_0 AD e^{-2i\omega_1 t} c_2(t) \tag{15}$$

$$\frac{dc_2(t)}{dt} = -ia\omega_0 AD e^{2i\omega_1 t} c_1(t) - ia_{22}\omega_0 A^2 c_2(t), \tag{16}$$

where a_{11}, a_{22} and a are the tracers. These coupled equations are exactly solved. At the end we take the tracers equal to 1 or 0 depending on the approximation under consideration. The differential equations in the adiabatic approximation are recovered by chosing $a = 0$. To make the rhs of the equations time independent, we define new variables, which is equivalent to going to the rotating frame. The new variables are

$$X_1(t) \equiv c_1(t) e^{i\omega_1 t} \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_2(t) \equiv c_2(t) e^{-i\omega_1 t}, \tag{17}$$

and they satisfy the equations

$$\frac{dX_1(t)}{dt} = i(\omega_1 - a_{11}\omega_0 D^2) X_1(t) - ia\omega_0 AD X_2(t) \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{dX_2(t)}{dt} = -ia\omega_0 AD X_1(t) - i(\omega_1 + a_{22}\omega_0 A^2) X_2(t). \tag{19}$$

Taking the general initial condition

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = c_1(0)|\phi_1;0\rangle + c_2(0)|\phi_2;0\rangle, \tag{20}$$

where $|\phi_i;0\rangle$, $i=1,2$, are the eigenstates of Hamiltonian (7) at $t=0$. The exact solutions of Eqs. (18) and (19) with the initial state (20) are

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(t) &= e^{-i[\omega_1+\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{11}D^2+a_{22}A^2)]t}\left\{c_1(0)cos(\Gamma t)+\right. \\ &+ \left.\frac{i\ sin(\Gamma t)}{\Gamma}\left[(\omega_1+\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{22}A^2-a_{11}D^2))c_1(0)-a\omega_0 ADc_2(0)\right]\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_2(t) &= e^{i[\omega_1-\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{11}D^2+a_{22}A^2)]t}\left\{c_2(0)cos(\Gamma t)+\right. \\ &- \left.\frac{i\ sin(\Gamma t)}{\Gamma}\left[(\omega_1+\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{22}A^2-a_{11}D^2))c_2(0)+a\omega_0 ADc_1(0)\right]\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

and

$$\Gamma \equiv \omega_1\left[\left(1+\frac{\omega_0}{2\omega_1}(a_{22}A^2-a_{11}D^2)\right)^2+a^2\left(\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1}\right)^2A^2D^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{23}$$

From Eqs.(21) and (22) we see that the nondiagonal terms in Eqs.(15) and (16) ($a\neq 0$) do not contribute to the overall phase in the expressions of $c_1(t)$ and $c_2(t)$. On the other hand, in the expressions of these coefficients there appears a new frequency Γ (Rabi's frequency[10, 11]). For $\omega_1\neq 0$ and $\omega_1 \gg \omega_0$, the contribution of the diagonal terms ($a_{11}\neq 0$ and $a_{22}\neq 0$) to the expression of frequency Γ is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})$ while the contribution of the nondiagonal terms ($a\neq 0$) is $\mathcal{O}((\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})^2)$. We get the geometric phase[2] when the external parameter (in our case $\vec{B}(t)$) completes a period $t=\frac{2\pi}{\omega_0}$[2] and for this time scale we can neglect contributions of $\mathcal{O}((\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})^2)$ to the frequency Γ. Those are exactly the contributions coming from nondiagonal terms in Eqs. (15) and (16). Due to this fact, we get the adiabatic limit by substituting $a=0$ in the expression of Γ.

The nondiagonal terms in Eqs.(15) and (16) also contribute to the *sine*-term in Eqs. (21) and (22). We now discuss the *sine*-term on the rhs of Eq.(21). A similar discussion is valid for Eq.(22). The *sine*-term in Eq.(21) is rewritten as

$$isin(\Gamma t)\left[\left(1-a^2(\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma})^2A^2D^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}c_1(0)-a\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma}ADc_2(0)\right]. \tag{24}$$

In the adiabatic regime we have $\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1} \ll 1$ and then from Eq.(23) it follows that $\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma} \ll 1$. Keeping terms up to zeroth order in $\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma} \ll 1$ in the *sine*-term (24), we obtain

$$isin(\Gamma t)\left[\left(1-a^2(\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma})^2A^2D^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}c_1(0)-a\frac{\omega_0}{\Gamma}ADc_2(0)\right]\approx ic_1(0)sin(\Gamma t). \tag{25}$$

Substituting the approximation (25) in the expression of $c_1(t)$, we get in the adiabatic limit

$$c_1^{a.a.}(t)=exp\left[-i\left(\omega_1+\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{11}D^2+a_{22}A^2)-\Gamma^{a.a.}\right)t\right]c_1(0), \tag{26}$$

with

$$\Gamma^{a.a.}=\omega_1\left[1+\frac{\omega_0}{2\omega_1}(a_{22}A^2-a_{11}D^2)\right], \tag{27}$$

that is, the Rabi's frequency in the adiabatic approximation.

By the same procedure we obtain, in the adiabatic regime,

$$c_2^{a.a.}(t)=exp\left[i\left(\omega_1-\frac{\omega_0}{2}(a_{11}D^2+a_{22}A^2)-\Gamma^{a.a.}\right)t\right]c_2(0). \tag{28}$$

Taking $a_{11}=a_{22}=1$, in Eqs.(26) and (28) we recover the known results for the adiabatic approximation[2, 6], which is equivalent to making $a=0$ in Eqs.(15) and (16) from the beginning.

We showed analitically, for a two-level model, why we get the correct adiabatic limit expressions by just neglecting the nondiagonal terms in the coupled equations (12) and (13). These first-order differential equations drive the time evolution of the expansion coefficients (1) for the quantum state on the basis of the instantaneous eigenstate of the time-dependent Hamiltonian.

It certainly could be questioned why terms of different orders in $(\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})$ are dropped in the expansions of the coefficients $c_i(t)$, $i=1,2$, and of the frequency Γ. The big difference between these two expansions is due to the fact that we are interested in time scale of order $T=\frac{2\pi}{\omega_0}$, where the linear correction in $(\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})$ to Γ gives a finite contribution. This does not happen to the linear correction $(\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_1})$ to the amplitude of the terms $\frac{sin(\Gamma t)}{\Gamma}$.

Even though we studied a soluble spin $\frac{1}{2}$ model, many features of this model appear in any quantum system that is coupled to a tridimensional external parameter that varies in time very slowly. For these models we can have a matrix representation of Eq.(3) on a suitable basis such that the coefficients can be written as a column where the equations

that drive their time evolution are a generalization of Eqs.(12) and (13). Neglecting the nondiagonal terms in the adiabatic limit is justified if they are multiplied by a phase whose angular velocity is much larger than the angular frequency of the external parameter.

Acknowledgements

A.C.A.P. and J.G.P.F. thank CNPq for financial support. M.C.N. thanks CNPq for partial financial support. M.T.T. thanks CNPq and FAPERJ for partial financial suport.

References

[1] M. Born and V. Fock, "Beweis des Adiabatensatzes", Z. Phys. **51**, 165-180 (1928).

[2] M.V. Berry, "Quantal Phase Factors Accompanying Adiabatic Changes", Proc. R. Soc. **A392**, 45-57 (1984).

[3] J. Anandan, J. Christian and K. Wanelik, "Resource Letter GPP-1: Geometric Phases in Physics", Am. J. Phys. **65**, 180-185 (1997).

[4] A.G. Wagh *et al.*, "Experimental Separation of Geometric and Dynamical Phases Using Neutron Interferometry", Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 755-759 (1997).

[5] C.L. Webb *et al.*, "Measurement of Berry's Phase Using an Atom Interferometer", Phys. Rev. **A60**, R1783-R1786 (1999).

[6] A. Böhm, *Quantum Mechanics: Foundations and Applications*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994), Chaps. XXII and XXIII.

[7] L.I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics*, 3rd ed., (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968), pp. 289-290;
A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, vol. II, 8th ed., (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 744-755.

[8] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, 7th ed., (Wiley, New York, 1996), pp. 420.

[9] J.D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 2rd ed., (Wiley, New York, 1975), pp. 542.

[10] I.I. Rabi, "Space Quantization in a Gyrating Magnetic Field", Phys. Rev. **51**, 652-654 (1937).

[11] C. Cohen-Tanoudji, B. Diu and F. Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics*, Volume I, (Wiley, Paris, 1977), pp. 413-415.